

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-31 are pending in the present application.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed July 31, 2002. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, and rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Reconsideration in light of the remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

### **I. DRAWINGS**

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to by the Draftsperson as noted in the form PTO 948. Applicants respectfully request postponement in submitting the formal drawings until the pending claims have been allowed.

### **II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(E)**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,272,109 issued to Pei et al. ("Pei"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Pei discloses hierarchical schedules for different ATM traffic. A scheduler utilizes one or more tables to assign traffic of a variety of types into respective cell transmit time slots (Pei, col. 5, lines 10-12). There are two types of tables: static and dynamic. One static table indexes virtual path connections (VPCs) and identifies high and low priority VCCs for CBR and VBR traffic. There is a separate, dynamic ABR table associated with each respective VPC (Pei, col. 13, lines 25-28).

Pei does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, dividing a hardware schedule table into N logical schedule tables, separating the N logical schedule tables by table delimiters, and assigning an identifier in one of the N logical schedules as claimed in independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25. Pei merely discloses several schedule tables. The static table contains virtual path index. Each line corresponds to one cell transmit time (Pei, col. 14, lines 47-53). Similarly, a dynamic table contains head and tail pointer to identify a line list of VCCs associated with a particular VPC (Pei, col. 15, lines 23-25). Even assuming that these tables correspond to hardware schedule tables, there are no corresponding logical schedule tables divided from such a hardware schedule table. Furthermore, there are no table delimiters separating the logical

schedule tables. Pei discloses that the scheduler traverses the static table by incrementing the cell time pointer (Pei, col. 13, lines 54-55), or reads the next line of the dynamic table each time the scheduler reads from a line of the static table (Pei, col. 14, lines 56-60). A table delimiter would interrupt the scheduler traversal and would render Pei technique non-workable. Lastly, since Pei does not disclose a logical schedule table, Pei does not disclose assigning an identifier in a logical schedule table.

For the similar reasons, dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-24, and 26-31, which depend on independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, respectively, are distinguishable from the cited prior art reference.

Therefore, Applicants believe that independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

**IN THE CLAIMS**

No changes have been made to the claims.


CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 31, 2002

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
THINH V. NGUYEN  
Reg. No. 42,034

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(714) 557-3800